

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-6, and 8-36 were pending at the time of the Office action. Claims 33 and 34 have been withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8-20, and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Claims 1, 3-6, 8-32, 35, and 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Applicant addresses these rejections as follows.

Interview with Examiner Mi

Applicant thanks Examiner Mi for the courtesy of an in-person interview on February 17, 2009. During the interview, the anticipation rejection of claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8-20, and 29 and the obviousness rejections of claims 1, 3-6, 8-32, 35, and 36 were discussed. As was discussed during the interview, Applicant submits that claims 1, 3-6, 8-32, 35, and 36 are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned by telephone in order to resolve any remaining issues in this case should the Examiner disagree.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8-20, and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Bickers et al. (*The Journal of Dermatology* 27: 691-695, 2000; herein “Bickers”), as evidenced by Dou et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0151582; herein “Dou”). According to the Examiner, Bickers teaches that “green tea, black tea and constituent polyphenols protect against chemical- and ultraviolet B (UVB)-induced carcinogenesis and reduce the growth of established tumors in skin” (Office action, page 3). The Examiner cites Dou as evidentiary support that the green tea extracts of Bickers contain polyphenolic compounds (e.g., EGCG). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The present claims are directed to a method of treating precancerous lesions (e.g., actinic keratoses) by administration of a polyphenol-containing composition to a patient. Applicant has demonstrated the effectiveness of this method and describes these results in